

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Charter Communications, on behalf of its)	
subsidiaries and affiliates)	CSR 8247-E
)	
Petition for Determination of Effective)	
Competition in Glendale, California (CUID)	
CA0180))	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Adopted: January 14, 2010

Released: January 14, 2010

By the Senior Deputy Chief, Policy Division, Media Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Charter Communications, on behalf of its subsidiaries and affiliates, hereinafter referred to as “Petitioner,” has filed with the Commission a petition pursuant to Sections 76.7, 76.905(b)(2) and 76.907 of the Commission’s rules for a determination that Petitioner is subject to effective competition in the community listed on Attachment A and hereinafter referred to as the “Community.” Petitioner alleges that its cable system serving the Community is subject to effective competition pursuant to Section 623(l)(1)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (“Communications Act”),¹ and the Commission’s implementing rules,² and is therefore exempt from cable rate regulation in the Community because of the competing service provided by two direct broadcast satellite (“DBS”) providers, DirecTV, Inc. (“DirecTV”), and Dish Network (“Dish”). The petition is unopposed.

2. In the absence of a demonstration to the contrary, cable systems are presumed not to be subject to effective competition,³ as that term is defined by Section 623(l) of the Communications Act and Section 76.905 of the Commission’s rules.⁴ The cable operator bears the burden of rebutting the presumption that effective competition does not exist with evidence that effective competition is present within the relevant franchise area.⁵ For the reasons set forth below, we grant the petition based on our finding that Petitioner is subject to effective competition in the Community listed on Attachment A.

II. DISCUSSION

3. Section 623(l)(1)(B) of the Communications Act provides that a cable operator is subject to effective competition if the franchise area is (a) served by at least two unaffiliated multi-channel video programming distributors (“MVPDs”), each of which offers comparable video programming to at least 50 percent of the households in the franchise area; and (b) the number of households subscribing to programming services offered by MVPDs other than the largest MVPD exceeds 15 percent of the

¹See 47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(1)(B).

²47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2).

³47 C.F.R. § 76.906.

⁴See 47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(1) and 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b).

⁵See 47 C.F.R. §§ 76.906 & 907.

households in the franchise area.⁶ This test is otherwise referred to as the “competing provider” test.

4. The first prong of this test has three elements: the franchise area must be “served by” at least two unaffiliated MVPDs who offer “comparable programming” to at least “50 percent” of the households in the franchise area.⁷

5. Turning to the first prong of this test, it is undisputed that the Community is “served by” both DBS providers, DIRECTV and Dish, and that these two MVPD providers are unaffiliated with Petitioner or with each other. A franchise area is considered “served by” an MVPD if that MVPD’s service is both technically and actually available in the franchise area. DBS service is presumed to be technically available due to its nationwide satellite footprint, and presumed to be actually available if households in the franchise area are made reasonably aware of the service’s availability.⁸ The Commission has held that a party may use evidence of penetration rates in the franchise area (the second prong of the competing provider test discussed below) coupled with the ubiquity of DBS services to show that consumers are reasonably aware of the availability of DBS service.⁹ The “comparable programming” element is met if a competing MVPD provider offers at least 12 channels of video programming, including at least one channel of nonbroadcast service programming¹⁰ and is supported in this petition with copies of channel lineups for both DIRECTV and Dish.¹¹ Also undisputed is Petitioner’s assertion that both DIRECTV and Dish offer service to at least “50 percent” of the households in the Community because of their national satellite footprint.¹² Accordingly, we find that the first prong of the competing provider test is satisfied.

6. The second prong of the competing provider test requires that the number of households subscribing to MVPDs, other than the largest MVPD, exceed 15 percent of the households in a franchise area. Petitioner asserts that it is the largest MVPD in the Community.¹³ Petitioner sought to determine the competing provider penetration in the Community by purchasing a subscriber tracking report from the Satellite Broadcasting and Communications Association that identified the number of subscribers attributable to the DBS providers within the Community on a zip code plus four basis.¹⁴

7. Based upon the aggregate DBS subscriber penetration levels that were calculated using Census household data for 2006-06,¹⁵ as reflected in Attachment A, we find that Petitioner has demonstrated that the number of households subscribing to programming services offered by MVPDs, other than the largest MVPD, exceeds 15 percent of the households in the Community. Therefore, the second prong of the competing provider test is satisfied for the Community.

8. Based on the foregoing, we conclude that Petitioner has submitted sufficient evidence

⁶47 U.S.C. § 543(1)(1)(B); *see also* 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2).

⁷47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2)(i).

⁸*See* Petition at 3.

⁹*Mediacom Illinois LLC*, 21 FCC Rcd 1175, 1176, ¶ 3 (2006).

¹⁰*See* 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(g). *See also* Petition at 4-5.

¹¹*See* Petition at 5 & Exh. 1.

¹²*Id.* at 3.

¹³*Id.* at 7.

¹⁴Petition at 5-7. A zip code plus four analysis allocates DBS subscribers to a franchise area using zip code plus four information that generally reflects franchise area boundaries in a more accurate fashion than standard five digit zip code information.

¹⁵Petition at 7 n.26.

demonstrating that both prongs of the competing provider test are satisfied and Petitioner is subject to effective competition in the Community listed on Attachment A. In light of that finding, we need not address Petitioner's claim that it is also subject to "local exchange carrier" effective competition¹⁶ in the Community.

III. ORDERING CLAUSES

9. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that the petition for a determination of effective competition filed in the captioned proceeding by Charter Communications on behalf of its subsidiaries and affiliates **IS GRANTED**.

10. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the certification to regulate basic cable service rates granted to the Community set forth on Attachment A **IS REVOKED**.

11. This action is taken pursuant to delegated authority pursuant to Section 0.283 of the Commission's rules.¹⁷

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Steven A. Broecker
Senior Deputy Chief, Policy Division, Media Bureau

¹⁶47 U.S.C. § 543(1)(1)(D); *see also* 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(4).

¹⁷47 C.F.R. § 0.283.

ATTACHMENT A**CSR 8247-E****COMMUNITY SERVED BY SUBSIDIARIES AND AFFILIATES OF CHARTER
COMMUNICATIONS**

Community	CUID(s)	CPR*	Census Households	Estimated DBS Subscribers
Glendale	CA0180	21.09%	71,323	15,041

*CPR = Percent of competitive DBS penetration rate.